

Applic. No. 10/075,670
Amdt. dated May 31, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

MAY 31 2007

Remarks/Arguments:

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 1-9 remain in the application. Claims 1 and 7 have been amended.

In the second paragraph on page 2 of the above-identified Office action, claims 1, 4, 5, and 7-9 have been rejected as being fully anticipated by Notredame (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,390) under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

The rejection has been noted and the claims have been amended in an effort to even more clearly define the invention of the instant application. The claims are patentable for the reasons set forth below. Support for the changes is found on page 10, lines 15-17 and page 11, lines 19-21 of the specification.

Before discussing the prior art in detail, it is believed that a brief review of the invention as claimed, would be helpful.

Claims 1 and 7 call for, *inter alia*:

Applic. No. 10/075,670
Amdt. dated May 31, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

storing the raster data column by column in a raster memory with random access while being generated by a raster processor, the raster memory and the raster processor being arranged on one common board.

On page 6 of the Office action, the Examiner alleges that "the claim does not require that the generation and storage must occur within the same unit."

Claims 1 and 7 have been amended so as to require that the memory and the raster processor are arranged on one common board. Therefore, it is respectfully noted that the allegation by the Examiner is no longer valid.

Notredame discloses that the rapid merge system (1003) consists of a computer system (110), which is also shown in Fig. 1. The computer system includes a random access memory (130) and a hard disc (146) (column 14, line 63 and column 15, line 20). This disclosure alone shows that the rapid merge system (1003) and the RIP system (1009) are not the same computer system and are not on a common board. It is also disclosed in Fig. 10 that the rapid merge system (1003) and the RIP system (1009) are not the same computer system and are not on a common board. Fig. 10 shows that two RIP systems

Applic. No. 10/075,670
Amdt. dated May 31, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

(1009) are provided which are both connected to a common rapid merge system (1003).

Claims 1 and 7 of the instant application require that all raster data coming out of the raster image processing system can be read out column by column and do not need to be converted as is required in the memory of the rapid merge system of Notredame.

As seen from the above-given remarks, the reference does not show storing the raster data column by column in a raster memory with random access while being generated by a raster processor, the raster memory and the raster processor being arranged on one common board, as recited in claims 1 and 7 of the instant application.

Since independent claims 1 and 7 are believed to be allowable, dependent claims 4, 5, 8, and 9 are believed to be allowable as well.

In the second paragraph on page 4 of the above-identified Office action, claims 2, 3, and 6 have been rejected as being obvious over Notredame (U.S. Patent No. 6,049,390) in view of Agarwal (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0022815 A1) under 35 U.S.C. § 103. Agarwal does not make up for the deficiencies

Applic. No. 10/075,670
Amdt. dated May 31, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

of Notredame. Since claim 1 is believed to be allowable, dependent claims 2, 3, and 6 are believed to be allowable as well.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 1 or 7. Claims 1 and 7 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art and since all of the dependent claims are ultimately dependent on claims 1 or 7, they are believed to be patentable as well.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-9 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel respectfully requests a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

If an extension of time for this paper is required, petition for extension is herewith made.

Applic. No. 10/075,670
Amdt. dated May 31, 2007
Reply to Office action of April 9, 2007

Please charge any other fees which might be due with respect
to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner
Greenberg Stemer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,



For Applicant(s)

Alfred K. Dassler
52,794

AKD:cgm

May 31, 2007

Lerner Greenberg Stemer LLP
Post Office Box 2480
Hollywood, FL 33022-2480
Tel: (954) 925-1100
Fax: (954) 925-1101